

**NPS PMC Meeting August 7-8,2001  
Seattle, WA**

**Members Present:**

Paul Anderson (AKR), Warren Brown (WASO-Prof Services), John Burns (WASO Cultural PM Coordinator), John Duran (PM Coordinator-NCR), Ron Everhart (DRD IMR), Anna Marie Fender (Strategic Planning Office), Deny Galvin (Deputy Director), Dave Given (DRD MWR), Lee Gurney (PM Coordinator-NER), Patricia Hooks (DRD SER), Heather Huyck (WASO-COLO), Troy Lissimore (PM Coordinator-SER), John Maounis (NER, Goal Group I Cultural), Sue Masica (WASO-NLC), John Renaud (WASO-GG III), Dick Ring (WASO-Operations), Pat Tiller (WASO-CR), Mike Tollefson (GRSM-SER), Bill Walter (DRD PWR), Sandy Walters (DRD NER), Rory Westberg (PM Coordinator-PWR)

**Members Absent:**

Larry Belli (EVER-SER), Mary Bomar (OKCI-IMR), Bill Fink (PM Coordinator-MWR), Maureen Foster (WASO-Admin), Jim Giammo (WASO-Budget), Joe Lawler (DRD NCR), Ron Thoman (PM Coordinator-IMR), Lou Waller (PM Coordinator-AKR)

**Others Present:**

Linda Dahl (facilitator), Michael Brown, Rick Harris, Eileen Peterson (Strategic Planning Office), Martha Akins (Independence NHP)

Thanks to Nancy Stromsem & Rory Westberg of PWR for arranging for the facilities for us.

Welcome John Burns new PM Coordinator

**Status Reports**

Anna Marie Fender updated the group on activities of the Strategic Planning Office and her perspectives of the last 6 months (since the PMC Meeting in January).

Deny Galvin updated the group on current issues facing the NPS.

We need to tell the story about resources reservation that can convert to political support for that protection. Need to play a broader roll in visitor/non-visitor education.

NPS Advisory Board – Willingness to help/support NPS is overwhelming. (Advisor Board report handed out at meeting)

We should not be afraid of our failures, we should be ashamed of what are targets are. There are going to be failures, and they SHOULD get people excited so we get something DONE about it. We NEED to think in terms of outcomes.

Mike Brown gave the group a status report on the 2001 APR and 2003 APP.

Sandy Walter asked if there was any talk from above (DOI & OMB) about consequences for non-performance

Deny Galvin responded - not yet. However, a discussion about accountability is important, not punishment for failure, there are many reasons for not achievement.

**Panel Discussion: Political Environment**

Advisory Board:

The NPS Advisory Board sees the NPS as an educational forum. We need to link Learning Centers with education and make research available to everyone from managers to grade school kids

Relationships between Heritage Areas and parks – good relationship for NPS and the communities.

How will this report impact our next strategic plan? As an example: how do we know we are doing a good job of informal learning such as might take place in museums. Effectiveness – short and long term impacts.

How do we begin to measure long-term effectiveness of our programs?

Next steps, what are the outcomes, what are we going to measure?

The NLC is looking at the document as good thing, and willing to move with it  
Sue Masica reported that Regula is willing to use his committee on education to work with NPS on implementing education issues from the Advisory Group report.

### **Stewardship Plans/Legacy Project**

Sue Masica reported on "Stewardship Plans/Legacy Project" and how the NPS is going to respond to this need. Legacy Project primarily came out of White House not OMB. OMB is trying to figure out what it means. It calls for annual report by Secretary on "State Of Parks" and Stewardship Plans. OMB seems to be willing to use existing plans/reports to meet the second need. Park GMP and Resource Management Plans and business plans may cover these needs. Maybe we can just add stewardship element to existing plans -- will have to have "Stewardship" plans for all parks soon. So far OMB is willing to let us decide how to handle the need. Deny Galvin suggest we incorporate needed information in next annual performance report.

Bill Walter: If we want parks to do this for FY 01 we need to get the information to them ASAP.

Gary Machlis reminded the group that a "State of the Parks" report was done in 70's. and it should be used as a starting point for this requirement.

Dick Ring asked "Who has the rose pinned on them to get theses two things done?"

Deny Galvin supported the proposed connection/integration of strategic and annual plans with stewardship plans. Need to respond to OMB on what we are going to do.

Need to make further determination as to who, what and how we will deal with Stewardship Plans. This is a question of appropriate office that has the 'capacity' to handle additional workload.

Mike Brown suggested that maybe the APR can respond to some of this but it can not respond to the entire need. Already the APP/APR are dealing with initiatives OMG has for bureaus to address, 2 are directly aimed at NPS. For 2003 we probably will need specific goals for maintenance & facilities.

### **Park Program Management (PPM)**

Ed Wood made a presentation on Park Program Management (PPM)

Goal of PPM is to incorporate numerous data systems into a single reporting/accounting system.

Without extensive increase in bandwidth, systems will fail!

Currently no way to create data off-line and download online.

All data base managers met in GRCA to discuss PPM and determine:

We need commitment of time, personnel, and funding. So far the 10 committee members are funding own participation and effort.

Need someone/someplace to assume management of this database (it needs a home and money).

The 35 functional groups from Business Plans will be part of a PPM screen so that parks can develop Business Plans in PPM and can load existing Business Plan information. Also need standard plans for tasks identified (build these up as we go) templates would be added to systems as users develop them.

October 30-Nov1 there will be a meeting in DC to discuss results of first pilot park (REWD).

ARPO will be second pilot park. Current timeline calls for full implementation (pending funding, personnel, equipment) Sept 30, 2006.

Dick Ring recommend testing group continue work and resources be found to support the work.

Need \$30k immediately. Deputy RDs are meeting the end of August in LA and that would be an opportunity to approach them on \$.

### *Visitor Surveys*

Gary Machlis reported to the group on the Visitor Survey Card project for this FY. 24% response rate (27,852), 305 parks successfully completed VSC Survey, 186 of 305 at or above 95%, very little variation by region - all about 95%. Technical audits were conducted of 30 randomly selected NPS units. 80% of units are reporting correctly in PMDS. 180 parks (59%) parks responded to U of ID customer survey.

Based on customer survey: 1) improvements made to instructions, 2) expanded drop box program - 26 parks using drop box method (6 last year), 3) discontinued foreign language cards, and 4) increased contact with park coordinators.

Year to date response rate is 32% for VSC.

For FY 02 survey we will continue to use current form to get to 5 years of data.

Based on survey results, suggest continued survey of every park every year.

Checking on rivers and trails in VSC is not going well – needs more work before we add to survey.

**Next Strategic Plan** due dates were discussed (see timeline distributed for meeting):

Discussion on “Management Reviews” and validation and verification: Need sampling from all the regions on a regular basis to demonstrate that capability. Must be able to verbalize a process and longer term plans in order to meet IG and GAO needs. Look at how V&V will fit into current plans for OE or Management Assistance Programs across the service.

Discussion on drafting Technical Guidance when the goals are still being negotiated. Some in group suggest that draft guidance not be done, whereas a draft of the technical guidance will provide workload and draft information that the parks and programs need to evaluate the draft goals. Goals that are totally WASO owned may not need complete technical guidance drafts at the January due date.

Dec to Jan: Opportunity for Strategic Planning Office to review and package the goals and provide a refined package. (i.e. review with Deputy Director/Director, PMC, goal groups, etc.)

DOI (and OMB) will take a more proactive role in the development of goals. Although most of the goals either organization develops tend to be process oriented and thus have less of an impact on the field.

Public Input: Needed for the major revisions because they are not just updates. We need to have the public input on any major revisions or new goals.

**Simplification/ Review Report** (see materials distributed for meeting).

#### **Goal Group reports:**

See attachments at end of this summary for detailed reports.

Items not included in reports but discussed during PMC meeting:

#### GG 1 – NR

Concern was expressed over WASO offices seeking random sampling, going to parks might not give a random sample. Regions (such as AKR did) could negotiate with WASO on what and when. This a generic issue and must be resolved.

DRDs willing to work with WASO Program Manager to determine how to do this.

#### Next Strategic Plan

How can we get next Strategic Plan to reflect important documents recently issued?

1. Focus on what needs to be measure and worry about how it is grouped in Strategic Plan later
2. Modify language of current goals to reflect some of the documents concerns/recommendations better. (Don't want to be ahead of Administration on implementing suggestion of Advisory Board so plan to just adjust wording of current goals. Later adopt goals to more closely reflect recommendations accepted by NLC and Administration.)
3. Set up a work group to focus on needed goal changes. (no action taken, no volunteers to do this)

#### GG III

NNL goals suspended until we can get data. Goal Group III feels the need to address the natural resource issue but maybe not the NNL program. Goal Group III should check with Abby Miller to find a better way to address natural resources issues.

#### Goal Group IV

Sue Masica; this group not functioning in part because there is too much diversity in group.

Briefing on recommendations of the Goal Group concerning status of Goal Category IV goals for next Strategic Plan (see attachment for comments). Need to get input from this group on the recommendations, then consolidate and summarize responses, report back to group. Make plan for presenting to OMB.

DENY: if we plan to drop any of the OMB directed goals, OMB will need to be consulted prior to that action. Need to consult with OMB about dropping/changing other goals if we are tracking elsewhere, etc.

NLC will ultimately have the vote on goals to be kept or dropped.

#### **Functioning of Goal Groups**

We need to determine how the Goal Groups are functioning and what can be done to help them function as planned.

Rory Westberg: Are the Goal Groups working from the perspective of the NLC?

Bill Walters: I think my Goal Group leaders would disagree with what the role and function should be.

John Renaud: Some of the functions are working okay. My Goal Group leaders don't think they control achievement of goals - either targets or funding distribution.

Sue Masica: Goal Groups were set up when NLC was not paying much attention to STPL goals. If this is not working, how can we fix it?

Anna Marie Fender: I will distribute R&F to Goal Group leadership (NLC) and will contact each of the chairs for further discussion. STPL Staff will redo R&F to reflect comments made during the meeting. All members of the Goal Groups need to review the statement and STPL will facilitate that review. Further discussion will occur with the Directorate to clarify the role and function statements, assure concerns are addressed, and that the overall organization of the "network" of PMC, Goal Groups, Strategic Planning, NLC will be clarified.

NLC check on how they think Goal Groups are functioning, are they meeting their expectations, (Anna Marie Fender will give Deny some data). They should have R&F statement for reference. If they are not working how can NLC fix it.

#### **Regional Consistency**

Report on progress with Regional Consistency on Performance Management requirements.

A couple of edits to the chart were discussed. Still planning on PMDS or PPM solving some of the document format issues

#### **Discussion Issues and Decisions:**

##### **Balanced Scorecard:**

At the next PMC meeting, Office of Strategic Planning will describe what the problem is and what are some options to solve the problem.

Office of Strategic Planning will provide a mock-up of a balanced scorecard model of a goal and see if that approach can solve any of our goal problems.

##### **Training Issues:**

Superintendents and program and resource managers in parks and regions need training.

Ron Everhart suggested tying training to other events, such as next strategic plan – we will need to train some park folks and park management teams need to have the training. Issue is preparing Park Service to prepare its strategic plans because all else flows from and depends on the development of GOOD Strategic Plans. Need consultation with regions on what training will be given by who.

**Changing goal structure**

Such as:

Goal weighting

Park identification of vital signs (raw data not in PMDS, so no V/V possible from PMDS)

Changes in goal structure may not be seen until 2<sup>nd</sup> out Strategic Plan.

Challenges and Advisory Group may impact goals and plans.

**Goal Changes for next Strategic Plan:**

IF goal groups are proposing to drop goals, we need some explanations/justifications to take to NLC and OMB. .

Goal Groups will send goals to Office of Strategic Planning, they will see if goals work (work with Goal Contacts). Office of Strategic Planning will review with Deputy Director and Director and make recommendations. Based on Deputy and Director decision, goals will or will not go to NLC

**Regional consistency in “soft money”**

Need an approach to do this. Associate RDs for Administration are the ones to talk to. STPL (Mike Brown) needs to make a list of what the problems are and what is needed and present to that group.

**Next Meetings:****February 13& 14 in DC**

Review goals prior to goals going to NLC and offer PMC recommendations

Report on balanced scorecard

PPM update

**August 21-22 Boston****Attachments:**

Goal Group I – Cultural

Goal Group I – Natural and Goal Group II

Goal Group III

Goal Group IV recommendations (sent under separate cover)

## **Goal Group I Cultural Resources Report**

There has not been a meeting of Goal Group I, Cultural Resources, since the Cultural Resources 2000 meeting in Santa Fe last December, which John Maounis reported on at the last Performance Management Council meeting.

The condition baselines for the LCS (I.a.5.) and CLI (I.a.7.) were changed from fixed to dynamic to more accurately reflect reality. The target percentages have not changed. The condition baseline for archeological resources (I.a.8.) similarly changed from a fixed to a dynamic baseline.

There are two program evaluations underway. The first program evaluation is in I.a.6., condition of museum collections. It is well underway, with completion expected in early FY 2002. It will be circulated for review within the Goal Group shortly thereafter.

The second program evaluation is in I.a.8., condition of archeological resources. Frank McManaman asked that completion be delayed until FY 2002; about half will be completed by the end of FY 2001. They have a process defined and will take a statistically valid sampling based on ASMIS data. Terry Childs reports that the parks involved have been “incredibly responsive” and that they are collecting cost information.

Some observations:

Goal Group I, Cultural Resources, has not met for eight months. While the Servicewide Goal Group Contacts have continued to make progress, the Goal Group will obviously need to work together in the next several months to prepare for the new strategic plan.

The Goal Groups cannot work in isolation. John Maounis has suggested joint meetings between Goal Group I, Cultural Resources, and Goal Group III to discuss commonalities and overlap, and between the cultural and natural resources groups within Goal Group I. At the very least, there should be a liaison relationship among the Goal Groups.

Kate Stevenson participated in the Goal Group III meeting on Monday. Since she also co-chairs Goal Group I, Cultural Resources, I want to share some comments she made at that meeting concerning the draft “Role and Function of NPS Goal Groups.” In part, that document states, “Each Goal Group . . . will ensure . . . that the targets are met, or when they are not met, determining what remedial action is taken.” Kate’s argument is that Goal Groups cannot ensure that targets are met nor do they have the authority to dictate remedial actions. John Renaud will report on the larger discussion when he reports on Goal Group III.

Compiled by John A. Burns

August 8, 2001

## **Report Goal Group 1 Natural**

Goal Group 1 met the week of July to evaluate the current goal set and begin the process of revising the goals in response to many who feel they need to be more relevant for parks. It was determined at the conclusion of the meeting that although everything may not be in place for the 2004 Strategic Plan, we would strive to ensure a new goal structure would be in place for 2007.

Servicewide goal contacts are highly engaged and look at their assignment as a major part of their duties. There are several data requirements needed to be coordinated by the goal contacts for the 2004 and 2007 plans. Servicewide Goal Contacts are already working with their regional counterparts.

Goal Group I Natural feels that the group is working with top level management engaged in the process and is very concerned about verification and validation process. The goal group has determined that an approach to natural resource goals using the desired future condition of resources approach is a

methodology worth attempting to implement. Doing so will mean that in many instances these conditions would be determined and tracked at the park level.

The group did address the wilderness goal issue and looked at the need vs. the reason to have a goal in the natural resource category. Group representatives will continue to work with the Wilderness community to determine the need. A concern of the goal group is how we manage natural resources in wilderness vs outside wilderness and if the NPS should or does manage resources to a different standard. Other land management agencies with wilderness responsibility manage resources external to Wilderness differently. Goal group members will work Wilderness Steering Committee to identify what would be the justification for a wilderness goal and what type of measures would be used.

It was noted that OMB is putting pressure on to tie the Natural Resource Challenge to outcomes. Deny commented that the Natural Resources Year in Review tells about the various accomplishments, but does not talk about the linkages to goals (outcomes). This should be part of every Natural Resources Year in Review. The outputs should link to our outcomes and that OMB would view this favorably.

## **Goal Group Category II**

Goal Group II met yesterday (August 9) and evaluated progress on goals to date. A major concern of the group centered around the education goal IIbX. Although the group did not reach a consensus to drop the goal, it agreed that a better goal was needed that was not "optional" to use. It was determined that the National Park System Advisory Board Report may generate a better goal to replace the current goal. Educational experts could also be engaged to assist. It was suggested that perhaps GG II and III should meet to discuss education issues.

The goal group discussed the concerns for a Wilderness goal and agreed that such a goal might be appropriate in this category. The group would assign a member(s) to meet with the Wilderness Steering Committee and include Dr. Gay Machlis in further discussion to determine the possibility of tying any surveys to wilderness permits issued to users. It was agreed that members from the group would begin dialogue with other agencies who have responsibility for wilderness management and that group members would try and tie some of this to the upcoming Carhart training to be held in Alaska the month of September.

It was agreed by the group, that the Service needs to adopt a rolling average for the visitor safety goal, beginning with the next Strategic Plan. Although this would mean that ALL parks must refigure their baseline, it was felt that this would not be a significant burden. Midwest region has already required all parks in the region to do this. Northeast, Southeast, and Intermountain regions were considering this for their parks. It was agreed that in order for this to work all regions needed to do this and that they would do so by the next Strategic Plan.

Gary Machlis also proposed that the Service might want to consider expanding upon information captured about visitors to include looking at the "footprint" of the impact per visitor per visit.

The next Visitors Goal Group meeting will be held in January of 2002.

## **Goal Group III -- Legislated Partnerships**

[This written version is typed from the notes that John Renaud used in his oral report]

Goal Group III met on August 6, 2001. The agenda items for the meeting fell into three main areas; i.e., 1) Goal Group Management, 2) Issues Relating to the Current Planning Cycle, and 3) the next Strategic Plan. This report follows that agenda and, in addition, answers the questions that the Office of Strategic Planning asks to be covered in its notes for Goal Group reports.

### **I. Goal Group Management**

This subject was made a part of the agenda because during our last Goal Group conference call in April, we agreed that the Goal Group was not working as efficiently and effectively as we wanted it to.

A. Membership

- The current membership is diverse in its views of how NPS should implement performance management in Goal Category III. This ensures that issues are thoroughly explored from several points of view. To illustrate this, John Reynolds characterized the August 6<sup>th</sup> meeting as featuring "intense but friendly" discussion.
- The Goal Group has good expertise on NPS programs that help our partners protect their cultural and recreational resources.
- PROBLEM: The Goal Group is weak in its knowledge of NPS programs that help partners protect their natural resources

SOLUTION: Kate Stevenson will ask Mike Soukup and/or Abby Miller to suggest people to join our Goal Group to address our weakness in this area.

- PROBLEM: Servicewide Goal Contacts are not thoroughly and routinely involved in Goal Group activities.

SOLUTION:

- John Burns, Rory Westberg, Nancy Stromsem, and John Renaud developed a set of questions to poll all of our Servicewide Goal Contacts concerning their opinions and suggestions on the agenda items for the Goal Group's meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup>.
- The Goal Group created rotating slots on the Goal Group membership list for Servicewide Goal Contacts to attend Goal Group meetings.

B. Meetings/Communication

- The Goal Group meets face-to-face on an as-needed basis. That being said, the Goal Group likes the connection this time with the Performance Management Council (PMC) meeting. Attendance at this recent Goal Group meeting was better than it has been in the past. We intend to tie our Goal Group meetings to future PMC meetings.
- REQUEST TO PMC: Please schedule two meetings ahead of time. [Note: The PMC agreed with the request and scheduled the next two meetings.]
- The Goal Group uses e-mail and telephone conference calls to do most of its business.
- The Goal Group asked and Mike Brown agreed to post (at least a summary of) the minutes of Goal Group III meetings. This information will appear at the Office of Strategic Planning Web Site.

C. Role and Function Statement for Goal Groups

Goal Group III has a number of problems with the draft Role and Function Statement for Goal Groups. I will save the detailed comments until the place in the PMC meeting agenda for discussing this subject. At this point, I will only mention our three biggest points.

- Members of Goal Groups are not in a position "to ensure that goals are met."



- Members of Goal Groups are not in a position to "ensure" that funds are shifted to meet goals or to "ensure" that the NPS Budget facilitates meeting the goals.
- A draft Goal and Functions Statement should be circulated for review and comment to all members of all goal groups. Goal groups won't buy into the Role and Function Statement if we don't allow them to participate in its development.

#### D. Other

- REQUEST TO PMC: Goal Group III asks that members of the PMC push for aligning the Budget documents with the Strategic Plan Goals. It is hard to do performance-based management without performance-based budgeting.

### II. Current Plan Cycle Issues -- Timeliness of Data

THE PROBLEM: For a number of goals, the Servicewide Goal Contacts have difficulty in getting final data in time for each year's Annual Performance Report. Part of the problem is that the Federal Grant cycle doesn't mesh well with the Federal planning/budget cycle. Federal law does not allow us to ask our grantees to report on their activities until 90 days after the end of the grant period; i.e., the earliest that we can expect reports is December 31. Many are not timely and most are not correct when submitted. We do not have final approved data from our grantees until the Spring.

We also get some of our data from voluntary surveys that we send to our partners. We take the responses that we have on hand and extrapolate that data to the total number of partners. Inevitably, responses come in after the Annual Performance Report (APR) is due and inevitably some partners send in responses (new or revised) for previous years.

#### OPTIONS:

- Submit the best information available for the just completed fiscal year at the last possible moment and recognize that we are using preliminary data. Correct the figures in the following year's APR. We use this approach now.
- Submit the information on the most recent fiscal year for which we have final data. For example, in the FY 2001 APR we would report on fiscal year 2000.

SOLUTION: After consultation with Mike Brown (of the Office of Strategic Planning), the Goal Group reached the following decision. For the FY 2001 APR, we will continue to use the best available data approach. However, in the FY 2001 APR, we will notify the reader that starting in the FY 2002 report, we will change approaches and report data for the most recent fiscal year for which we have data. The notification will explain why we are making this change.

### III. The Next Strategic Plan

#### A. Overarching Issues

- How can we get the next Strategic Plan major new policy documents such as the NPS Advisory Board Report, the Cultural Resources Challenge, the Natural Resources Challenge, etc.?
- Does the current organization of the Strategic Plan (e.g., the current four goal categories) still make sense given our experience since 1997?

SOLUTION: The Goal Group came to the following conclusions on how to deal with these issues.

- Focus on what needs to be measured now. We can discuss how goals are organized or grouped later.
- Take a two-track approach on ensuring that our goals reflect important policy documents.
  - 1) Modify the language of some existing goals to reflect the ideas/terminology/catch words of the policy documents.
  - 2) Establish a Goal Group III task force (or sub-group) to analyze whether/how separate goals will be necessary to more directly address the policy documents.

REQUEST TO PMC: This is an issue that the PMC may want to address. It applies to all of the Goal Categories and Goal Groups. It would make sense to approach this issue in a consistent manner throughout the Plan.

#### B. Actions Taken on Existing Goals -- General

- The Goal Group plans to drop the goal that relates to the archeological inventories of other Federal agencies. The rationale is that that particular goal does not accurately reflect the relationship that NPS has with other Federal agencies. For now, the National Register goal and the National Historic Landmark goals are better measurements.
- The other goals still make sense from a performance management perspective. However, in the case of five of the goals, we think that the goal language doesn't clearly convey to the non-expert reader/partner/customer what NPS is measuring.
- The Goal Group has appointed small work groups to revise the goal language. The draft revisions are due September 14<sup>th</sup>. The Goal Group will make its goal language decisions during its next conference call (currently scheduled for September 26<sup>th</sup>).

#### C. Customer Satisfaction

PMC REQUEST: The National Park Service is by definition a service organization. NPS deals with its customers in a multitude of ways. The current Strategic Plan has four customer satisfaction goals (two in Goal Category II and two in Goal Category III). Each of the four goals was developed independently. Each asks different things of different sets of customers. Some things don't get asked at all. Working within the context of a Goal Category or a Goal Group sometimes sets up artificial barriers and loses some of the Servicewide perspective.

Perhaps the PMC could put together a task force to take a more systematic look at whom we are asking, what we are asking, and how we are asking it.

[NOTE: On behalf of Goal Group II, Dick Ring volunteered to help set up a liaison with Goal Group III on this issue.]

#### D. The "X" Goal -- Parks Helping Partners Protect the Partner's Resources

This optional goal and its mirror image goal in Goal Category IV are not working well for a number of reasons. Other policy documents suggest that perhaps this goal should be mandatory rather than optional. There also has been some talk about bringing the two related goals together. Goal Group III has put Brian O'Neill in charge of a small group to look into the matter.